



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/614,772	07/12/2000	Masaaki Tanizaki	500.38695X00	2414

20457 7590 01/14/2005

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889

EXAMINER

TRAN, QUOC A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/614,772

Applicant(s)

TANIZAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 July 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/09/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Amendment A, filed 07/01/2004.
2. Claims 1-4, 6-21 are currently pending in this application. Claim 1 and 14 are independent claims. Applicant cancelled claim 5.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The objection of information disclosure statement filed on 07/12/2000 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), has been withdrawn since correction made.

Drawings

4. The drawings were received on 07/01/2004. The drawing of FIG. 9, element 901, page 9/16 is acknowledged.

Specification

5. The substitute specification filed 07/01/2004 has not been entered because it does not conform to 37 CFR 1.125(b) and (c) because: the additional add on specification includes new matter, see Amendment filed 07/01/2004, "IN THE SPECIFICATION", pages 2-3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

In regards to the First Office Action Mailed Date 11/10/2003, claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention has been withdrawn since correction made.

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-4 and 6-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There are new matters in claims. Evidence that claim 1 fail(s) to correspond in scope with that which applicant(s) regard as the invention can be found in the reply filed 07/01/2004. In that paper, applicant has stated:

... object property structure data ...object property structure data which corresponds to the application; generating a relationship between an object of the server and an object of the application ... the object property structure data ...displaying the object property structure data of an object pointed to by indication means on the display, and modifying and deciding the relationship between the objects ..., see claim 1 pages 4-5, and claim 14 pages 7-8,

...relationship between the objects, a similarity between the objects..., see claims 4, 6-13, and 15-21 pages 5-9,

and these statements indicate that the invention is different from what is defined in the claim(s) because: object.. , object property structure data..., displaying the object property structure data of an object pointed to by indication means on the display, and modifying and deciding the relationship between the objects based on a confirmation operation input from the indication means..., which are new matter, that are supported by the new added specification, see Amendment filed 07/01/2004, "IN THE SPECIFICATION", pages 2-3. Clarification and/or correction are required.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Reponse to the Amendment A, filed 07/01/2004. Claims 1, 4, and 6-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Evidence that claim 1 fail(s) to correspond in scope with that which applicant(s) regard as the invention can be found in the reply filed 07/01/2004. In that paper, applicant has stated:

... object property structure data ...object property structure data which corresponds to the application; generating a relationship between an object of the server and an object of the application ... the object property structure data ...displaying the object property structure data of an object pointed to by indication means on the display, and modifying and deciding the relationship between the objects ..., see claim 1 pages 4-5, and claim 14 pages 7-8,

...relationship between the objects, a similarity between the objects..., see claims 4, 6-13, and 15-21 pages 5-9,

, and this statement indicates that the invention is different from what is defined in the claim(s) because: object.. , object property structure data.., displaying the object property structure data of an object pointed to by indication means on the display, and modifying and deciding the relationship between the objects based on a confirmation operation input from the indication means..., which are new matter, that are not supported by the original specification, which is filed on 07/12/2000. Clarification and/or correction are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 6-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasnick et al. US005528735A - filed 03/23/1993 (hereinafter '735), in view of Bergman et al US006564263B1 – filed 12/03/1999 – provisional No. 60/110,902 - filed 12/04/1998 (hereinafter '263).

In regard to independent claim 1, “*generating a relationship between an object of the server and an object of the application based on the server definition data, the*

Art Unit: 2176

application definition data, the object property structure data and thesaurus data; displaying object hierarchical structure data of the server, and object hierarchical structure data of the application, with the generated relationship on a display; displaying the object property structure data of an object pointed to by indication means on the display, and modifying and deciding the relationship between the objects based on a confirmation operation input from the indication means", as taught by '735 at col. 20, lines 26-34 (i.e.... establishes a connection with a corporate database server to obtain data... data dictionaries... browsing through the data dictionaries for the available tables, the user identifies the tables containing the data for a sales application... retrieve the required data components from the database and loads them into specified columns in spreadsheet application worksheet... with a graphical query tool, a user performs the necessary queries and operations...), also as taught by '735 at col. 5, lines 20-45 (i.e... A File System Navigator... mouse... I/O....);

'735 does not teach, "*acquiring server object property structure data which corresponds to the server and application object property structure data which corresponds to the application*", however as taught by '263 at col.5, lines 15-45 (i.e.... archives or servers 102...), and also as taught by '263 at col. 16, lines 15-45 (i.e...

Representing Objects... Such spring-like objects can then be connected using the temporal relationships described herein above. This connected-spring model preferably allows built-in flexibility in the delivery system...reflecting the given relationships and the spring properties of the corresponding objects. Furthermore, an acceptable range of playback times of an object can be exploited by the playback...).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified '263 into '735 to provide a way, wherein acquiring server object property structure data which corresponds to the server and application object property structure data which corresponds to the application. One of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide a system that would prevented the lack of a unified of the multiple modalities/multiple fidelities nature of multimedia content, both spatial and temporal characteristics among multiple objects; and the lack of a means for describing both streams and aggregations of multimedia objects, as taught by '263 at col. 2, lines 60-67 (i.e... the lack of a unified means for describing the multiple modalities/multiple fidelities nature of multimedia content....).

In regard to dependent claim 2, "*displaying the object hierarchical structure*", as taught by '735 at col. 11, lines 43-45 (i.e... nodes are laid out recursively for each level of a partial hierarchy beginning at the bottommost end level of the partial hierarchy...),

"the form of display is changed depending on the type of a parent/child relationship between objects", as taught by '735 col. 4, lines 30-33 (i.e... lines between the cells. Connectors represent the contextual relationships between cells ... for example, parents and children...).

In regard to dependent claim 3, "*an object of the lowermost layer and an object of an intermediate layer are distinctively displayed*", as taught by '735 at col. 11, lines 43-45 (i.e... nodes are laid out recursively for each level of a partial hierarchy beginning at the bottommost end level of the partial hierarchy...).

In regard to dependent claim 4, “displaying a relationship between the objects, a similarity between the objects is displayed in a form reflected by types of lines or thickness of lines”, as taught by ‘753 col. 22, lines 30-33 (i.e... displays objects in the display space as columns of different heights...comparison between attributes...).

In regard to dependent claim 6, “relationship between the objects is displayed in order of a degree of certainty representing a height of a degree of association between the objects”, as taught by ‘753 at col. 22, lines 60-67 (i.e... displays a plane representing a threshold value within the display space; and displays a column underneath the threshold plane when the column represents a value below the threshold value represented by the plane...).

In regard to dependent claim 7, “*the object hierarchical structure and/or the relationship between objects are displayed with distinction for each view selected by a user*”, as taught by ‘753 col.11, lines 20-30 (i.e... a data base system hierarchy ... displayed in the split-screen or multi-screen mode, in which two or more interaction and display panels are displayed simultaneously...).

In regard to dependent claims 8-10 and 12-13, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 11, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale;

"displaying a list of the server definition data and a list of application definition data on a display", as taught by '735 at col. 20, lines 26-34 (i.e.... establishes a connection with a corporate database server to obtain data... data dictionaries... browsing through the data dictionaries for the available tables, the user identifies the tables containing the data for a sales application... retrieve the required data components from the database and loads them into specified columns in spreadsheet application worksheet... with a graphical query tool, a user performs the necessary queries and operations...). Examiner reads data dictionaries, which could interpreted as claimed *"a list of the server definition data"*.

In regard to claims 14-19, are directed to a system for performing the method of claim 1, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to claim 20, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 4, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to claim 21, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 7, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Argument

7. Examiner has completed a through study of Applicant's Amendments of 07/01/2004; especially, Applicant's amendments to claims 1-7 and newly added claims 8-21 and remarks at pages 10-19.

8. Newly submitted claims 8-21 are rejected above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasnick et al. US005528735A - filed 03/23/1993 (hereinafter

'735), in view of Bergman et al US006564263B1 – filed 12/03/1999 – provisional No. 60/110,902 - filed 12/04/1998 (hereinafter '263).

9. As for amended claims 1-7, have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

10. In view amendment, the reference of Bergman et al. US006564263B1 - filed 12/03/199, provisional No. 360/110,902 filed 12/04/1998 has been added for new ground of rejection.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 2176

4103. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Quoc A. Tran

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2176

January 04, 2005